



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09 866,573	05/25/2001	John S. Haurum	4305/1 J396-US1	4477

7590 01/28/2003

Kristina Bicker-Brady, Ph.D  
Clark & Elbing LLP  
101 Federal Street  
Boston, MA 02110

EXAMINER

NOLAN, PATRICK J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1644

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2003

19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/866,573

Applicant(s)

Haurum et al.

Examiner

Patrick J. Nolan

Art Unit

1644



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Nov 21, 2002
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5-14, and 23-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) 23-34 and 36-38 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5-14, 35, and 39-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO 413) Paper No(s): \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part III DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1, 5-14 and 23-49 are pending.
2. Applicant's election without traverse of species IgG, claim 35 in Paper No. 18 is acknowledged.  
Accordingly, claims 23-34 and 36-38 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to non-elected inventions.

**The following new ground of rejection is necessitated by the amendment filed 6-24-02.**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103<sup>©</sup> and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1, 5-14, 35 and 39-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,740,371 (A), newly cited, in view of U.S. Patent 5,789,208, of record.

The '371 patent teaches pharmaceutical compositions of IgG

polyclonal antibody or mixtures of antibody classes for the treatment of allergies wherein said polyclonal antibodies are human, complexed with negatively or positively charged excipients, are 100% target specific, do not elicit an anaphylactic response in humans, do not cross react with self antigens in a patient are given in a concentration with sufficient density to mediate the elimination of an allergen from a patient, are formulated for topical nasal administration, are free of the allergen to which the antibody is reactive (see specifically column 8, lines 15-33, in particular), are provided as a solution and wherein the allergen is derived from house dust mites in the range of 1ug to 1g per unit dosage form.

The claimed invention differs from the prior art teaching(s) by the recitation(s) of compositions comprising recombinant polyclonal antibodies made by phage display technology, wherein said antibodies have a mutation in the variable region. However, the '208 patent teaches making recombinant polyclonal antibodies with mutation in their variable regions because recombinant polyclonal antibodies are advantageous over conventional polyclonal antibodies because conventional polyclonal antibodies are in short supply and recombinantly made polyclonal antibodies can overcome that problem (column 5, lines) and the '208 patent teaches it is advantageous to introduce mutations into the genes which encode to the polyclonal antibody because said mutations increase library complexity and diversity as well as affinity for antigen which may further increase the library's usefulness in treatment (column 13 lines 19-23, in particular).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to substitute recombinant polyclonal antibodies taught by the '208 patent for conventional polyclonal antibodies as taught by the '371 patent for treating allergies because recombinant polyclonal antibodies solve the limited supply problem of conventional polyclonal antibodies as taught by the '208 patent. Further it would have been obvious to introduce mutations in the gene encoding the polyclonal antibody because it has an overall effect of increasing antibody affinity for antigen as taught by the '208 patent. From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole is prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references.

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for response to this final action

Serial Number: 09/866,573

4

Art Unit: 1644

is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the date of this action. In the event a first response is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event will the statutory period for response expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick Nolan whose telephone number is (703) 305-1987. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday through Friday from 9:00 am to 5:30 pm.

7. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan, can be reached at (703) 305-3973. The FAX number for our group, 1644, is (703) 305-7401. Any inquiry of a general nature relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist, whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.



Patrick J. Nolan, Ph.D.  
Primary Examiner, Group 1640  
January 24, 2003